

REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims pending in the application are requested.

Claims 1-8, 16-19 and 52-74 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8 and 16-19 are allowed. Claims 56-74 are rejected.

Claims 56-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Phillipsson (US 2001/0007815), hereinafter “Phillipsson” in view of Labun et al. (US 6,842,621), hereinafter “Labun”.

II. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 56-74 include features not disclosed or suggested in Phillipsson in view of Labun and overcome the rejection under 35 USC 13 (a), as follows:

1. Claim 56, in part:

“c) in response to the notification signal, activating the processor to instruct a wireless short-range communication module in the wireless communication terminal to enter into a predefined shortened session set-up operation mode for detecting paging signals. “

The Examiner acknowledges that Phillipsson fails to disclose feature c) “activating a processor.....in the terminal to enter into ...a shortened sessionfor detecting paging signals”. The Examiner contends that Labun discloses the feature at column 9, lines 30-34, wherein it is stated “an Access Point 504 instructs (signals) a Mobile Station 502 to enter a page scan mode, and it would be obvious to a worker skilled in the art to modify Phillipsson to enable a terminal to enter into a page scan mode. However, applicants’ specification at page 38, lines 1 -12 discloses a RF-ID module in the terminal informs or notifies a processor to place the terminal in a page scan mode via a terminal control circuit.

Labun describes a handover process controlled by an Access point, wherein the Access Point provides an external signal to a terminal to place the terminal in a page scan mode. In contrast, applicants describe a RF-ID operation between a reader and a wireless communication terminal (tag), wherein the tag provides an internal signal to a processor, in response to an interrogation signal, to place a wireless communication module within the terminal in a page scan mode via a terminal control circuit. A worker skilled in the art has no basis in Labun to implement applicants' page scanning mode in Phillipsson. Labun does not provide a signal within the terminal to place the terminal in a page scanning mode. Phillipsson in view of Labun fails to disclose feature c) for the reason previously indicated. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 56 is requested.

2. Claim 68:

The Examiner has rejected claim 68 on the same basis as claim 56, i.e. Labun provides the missing notification in Phillipsson to activate a processor to enter a terminal into a page scanning mode. Claim 68 is distinguishable from Phillipsson and Labun on the same basis as claim 56 Labun does not provide an internal signal within a terminal to place the terminal in a page scanning mode, which applicants recite in claim 68. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 68 is requested.

3. Claim 62:

The Examiner has rejected claim 62 on the same basis as claims 56 and 68, i.e. Labun provides the missing notification in Phillipsson to activate a processor to enter a terminal into a page scanning mode. Phillipsson and Labun fail to disclose or suggest a processor in a terminal responsive to a internal module instructing the module to detect paging signals to establish a short-range communication connection. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 62 is requested.

4. Claims 58 and 64:

The Examiner contends that Phillipson at Paragraph 0016 discloses the RF-ID signal includes a serial number and clock offset information, as recited in claims 58 and 64. Paragraph 0016a Bluetooth link of about 10 m. There is no disclosure in Paragraph 0016 of a serial number and clock offset information. Paragraph 0025 of Phillipsson describes a response signal includes a unique identification number of the pay terminal. The rejection of claims 58 and 64 is not supported in the cited art.

5. Claims 59, 65 and 69:

The Examiner contends that Labun at column 9, lines 30-34 describes claims 59, 65 and 69, which depend from independent claims 56, 62 and 68 respectively Labun fails to describe claims 59, 65, and 69 based on its failure to describe the subject matter of the independent claim from which they respectively depend.

6. Claims 60, 66 and 70:

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraph 0022 describes the claimed subject matter. Paragraph 0022 describes the transponder or tag receiving an interrogation signal and not a paging signal, as claimed by the Examiner. The rejection of claims 60, 66 and 70 is without support in the cited art.

7. Claims 61, 67 and 71:

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraph 0025 describes the claimed subject matter. Paragraph 0025 describes a respond signal includes a unique identification number of the pay terminal which is received by the sale terminal. The respond signal is separated and authenticated before a connection is established between the pay and sale terminals. There is no skipping of an inquiry stage by sale terminal in Paragraph 0025. The rejection of claims 61, 67 and 71 is without support in the cited art.

8. Claim 72:

The Examiner contends that Labun at column 9, lines 25-30 describes the subject matter of claim 72. Labun fails to describe claim 72, based on its failure to describe the subject matter of claim 1 from which claim 72 depends. The rejection of claims 72 is without support in the cited art.

9. Claim 73:

The Examiner contends that Labun at column 9, lines 25-30 describes the subject matter of claim 73. The cited text describes a Bluetooth Radio Network Control issuing a disconnect command to a roaming terminal when the roaming terminal moves to close to an adjacent Access Point. Applicants' specification at page 38, lines 5-12 discloses a wireless terminal maybe placed in a non-connectable state, which is not disconnected from a reader. In any event, claim 73 depends from claim 1 and is distinguishable from Labun on the same basis as claim 1. The rejection of claims 73 is without support in the cited art.

10. Claim 74:

The Examiner contends that Labun at column 9, lines 34-39 describes the subject matter of claim 74. The cited text describes a Bluetooth Radio Control Network (BRNC) device controlling the handover of a mobile station from one access point to another. In contrast, claim 74 describes a wireless terminal including a processor using a control circuit to determine if a connection between a first and a second terminal is acceptable. Labun determines connection acceptance by an external device. Applicants determine connection acceptance within a wireless terminal. The rejection of claims 74 is without support in the cited art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have distinguished pending claims 1-8, 16-19 and 56-74 from the cited art. No new matter has been included in the response. Entry of the response, allowance of the claims and passage to issue of the subject application are requested or in the alternative entry of the response for purpose of appeal is requested.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. **13-4500**, Order No. 4208-4047US1.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No **13-4500**, Order No. 4208-4047US1.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: January 23, 2008

By: /Joseph C. Redmond, Jr./

Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.

Registration No. 18,753

Correspondence Address:

Address Associated With Customer Number:

27123

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile